

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03597 01 OF 02 272254Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03 INR-10 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /152 W

----- 060407

P R 272158Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 6510

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3597

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DEFINED GROUND TRAINING AREAS

REF: A) USNATO 3262; B) STATE 138119

1. MISSION HAS RECIEVED COPY OF PROPOSED UK RE-WRITE OF WG DRAFT PAPER ON DEFINED GROUND TRAINING AREAS (LATEST TEXT REF A), TOGETHER WITH PREAMBULAR COMMENTS ON WHY UK FINDS CURRENT DRAFT UNACCEPTABLE. WG TAKES UP TRAINING AREA QUESTION ON JULY 2.

2. IMS THINKS MAIN REASON FOR NEW UK VERSION IS TO ENABLE THEM TO ABANDON CONCENTRATION ARGUMENT (PARA 4 OF OLD TEXT), AS WELL AS THE OPTION (OLD PARA 8A) OF INCLUDING AREAS CAPABLE OF EXERCISING FORCES OF BATTALION GROUP STRENGTH (I.E., DOWN TO 45-50 SQ. KM), BOTH OF WHICH THEY INITIATED.

3. IN LIGHT OF REF B GUIDANCE, JUST RECEIVED, WE PROPOSE TO
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03597 01 OF 02 272254Z

FOCUS JULY 2 WG DISCUSSION ON REF A PAPER AND INTRODUCE WASHINGTON'S INSTRUCTIONS IN A PARA-BY-PARA RUN-THROUGH. THIS WILL PLACE UK IN POSITION OF HAVING TO DISCUSS ITS PROPOSED TEXT IN RELATION TO U.S. AMENDMENTS. RESULT SHOULD THEN BE

FURTHER WG DRAFT WHICH WOULD INCLUDE BOTH U.S. AND UK REQUIREMENTS. IF WASHINGTON HAS FURTHER COMMENTS ON UK TEXT, MISSION WOULD APPRECIATE RECEIVING THEM IN TIME FOR JULY 2 WG MEETING.

4. TEXT OF UK NOTE FOLLOWS:

GENERAL

1. WE CANNOT ACCEPT THE PAPER AS DRAFTED FOR REASONS EXPLAINED BELOW.

2. PARAGRAPH 4. WE SUGGEST THAT THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE DELETED IN TOTO SINCE THE FOUR STABILISING MEASURES NOW PROPOSED BY NATO ARE NOT DESIGNED TO INHIBIT THE ABILITY OF EITHER SIDE TO CONCENTRATE FORCES NOW DEPLOYED WITHIN THE NGA. THERE IS NO CONSTRAINT PROPOSED ON MOVEMENT WITHIN THE NGA, ONLY ON THE SCALE AND NUMBER OF "MAJOR" EXERCISES, SO THE POINTS MADE ARE IRRELEVANT. IN FACT WE ALSO CONSIDER THAT THE STATEMENT AS DRAFTED IN SUB-PARA (C) IS NOT FACTUALLY CORRECT, WHILE WE WOULD AGREE THAT THE SECOND SENTENCE OF SUB-PARA (D) WOULD BE TRUE ONLY IF RELATED TO TRAINING AREAS CAPABLE OF ACCOMMODATING A DIVISION OR MORE FOR TACTICAL TRAINING.

3.3. PARAGRAPH 5. WE AGREE THE STATEMENT IN LINE 13 THAT "THE RELEVANCY OF THIS TYPE OF CALCULATION IN THE CONTEXT IS QUESTIONABLE".

WE THEREFORE CONSIDER THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE PRUNED AND RE-CAST.

4. PARAGRAPH 7 (A). THIS IS A CONCLUSION WHICH IS NOT DERIVED FROM ANY EARLIER STATEMENT IN THE PAPER. IT NEEDS AMPLIFICATION.

5. PARAGRAPH (8). THIS WAS PRESUMABLY DRAFTED TO TRY TO MEET A UK PROPOSAL. IF SO, IT IS NOT WHAT WE WISHED TO PROPOSE. AS IT STANDS, IT PROPOSES A POINTLESS MEASURE.

6. PARAGRAPH 9. IN VIEW OF THE ABOVE COMMENTS PARAGRAPH 9 WILL REQUIRE AMENDMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03597 01 OF 02 272254Z

REVISED DRAFT

7. WE ATTACH A REVISED DRAFT OF THE PAPER FOR DISCUSSION WITHIN THE WORKING GROUP. IT MEETS THE OBJECTIVES TO THE PRESENT DRAFT DESCRIBED ABOVE AND DISCUSSES THE FOUR APPROACHES (THE PREVIOUS DRAFT SAYS FIVE APPROACHES BUT WE SUGGEST THE COMBINATION OF TWO OF THEM) IN WHAT WE CONSIDER TO BE A MORE LOGICAL ORDER.

INTRODUCTION

1. (AS FOR PARA 1 OF 3RD REVISE).

2. (AS FOR PARA 2 OF 3RD REVISE).

3. AS FOR PARA 3 OF 3RD REVISE EXCEPT THAT THE WORDS "UNDERTAKEN BY US OR USSR FORCES" WOULD BE ADDED TO LINE 6 AFTER "10,000 MEN OR GREATER".

4. THE MBFR WORKING GROUP STARTED THEIR EXAMINATION BY IDENTIFYING THOSE TRAINING AREAS INCLUDED IN THE LISTS AT ANNEXES A AND B WHICH WOULD ACCOMMODATE A DIVISION OR 10,000 MEN FOR TACTICAL AND FIELD TRAINING. THE IDENTIFICATION OF SUCH AREAS INVOLVES JUDGEMENT AND SOME DEFINITION OF THE TYPE OF TRAINING TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN THE AREA. WHEREAS THE COMBAT ELEMENTS OF A DIVISION COULD BE DEPLOYED IN A AREA OF ABOUT 100 SQ KMS FOR AN EXERCISE INVOLVING POSITIONAL DEFENCE TACTICS IN A SCENARIO IN WHICH THE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS WAS UNLIKELY, SUCH AN AREA COULD ONLY BE USED TO EXERCISE ONE BRIGADE IF THE EXERCISE INVOLVED EITHER MOBILE DEFENCE TACTICS UNDER A NUCLEAR THREAT OR LIMITED TACTICAL OFFENSIVE MOVEMENTS. ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE SMALLEST TRAINING AREA CAPABLE OF ACCOMMODATING A WHOLE DIVISION FOR TACTICAL TRAINING IS ONE OF ABOUT 100 SQ KM, THERE WOULD BE ONLY 7 SUCH AREAS BELONGING TO NATO NATIONS IN THE GUIDELINES AREA (ALL IN FRG) AND 29 SUCH AREAS IN NSWP TERRITORY. DETAILS OF THESE AREAS ARE SHOWN IN ANNEX D.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03597 02 OF 02 272308Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03 INR-10 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /152 W

----- 060603

P R 272158Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 6511

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3597

THE US PROPOSAL

5. (AS FOR PARA 6 OF 3RD REVISE).

OTHER PROPOSALS

6. TO INCLUDE AS "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS" ONLY THOSE TRAINING AREAS WHICH EXCEED 100 SQ KM IN SIZE. THE RATIONALE FOR THIS PROPOSAL WOULD BE SIMILAR TO THAT FOR THE US PROPOSAL. THE DIFFERENCE WOULD BE THAT INSTEAD OF THE US AND USSR BEING ENTITLED TO DECIDE WHICH, IF ANY, OF THEIR TRAINING AREAS WOULD BE SPECIFIED AS "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS," ALL TRAINING AREAS IN WHICH A DIVISION COULD CARRY OUT TACTICAL TRAINING WOULD BE SO SPECIFIED AUTOMATICALLY. FROM A MILITARY/TECHNICAL POINT OF VIEW THIS PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE NEITHER LESS NOR MORE ADVANTAGE THAN THE US PROPOSAL (IN EITHER CASE THE USSR COULD CONTINUE TO HOLD DIVISIONAL SIZE EXERCISES IN THEIR TRAINING AREAS WITHOUT HAVING TO PRE-ANNOUNCE THEM). ON THE OTHER HAND, IT COULD HAVE SOME
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03597 02 OF 02 272308Z

POLITICAL ADVANTAGE IN THAT IT WOULD ENSURE THAT SOME TRAINING AREAS IN ALL THREE NSWP COUNTRIES WERE INCLUDED IN ADDITION TO SOME IN THE FRG, WHEREAS UNDER THE US PROPOSAL THERE WOULD BE A DANGER OF ONLY TRAINING AREAS IN THE FRG (AND PERHAPS IN THE GDR) BEING SINGLED OUT UNDER ANY MBFR AGREEMENT.

7. TO APPROACH THE LISTING OF "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS" ON THE BASIS THAT EACH SIDE WOULD HAVE EITHER AN EQUAL NUMBER OF SUCH AREAS (SAY, SOME 10 TO 12) OR AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE (SAY 50 PERCENT) OF THE KNOWN GROUND TRAINING AREAS. UNDER EITHER OPTION THE SIZE OF A TRAINING AREA WOULD NOT BE A MATERIAL FACTOR AND IN EITHER CASE TRAINING AREAS IN MORE THAN ONE COUNTRY FOR EACH SIDE COULD BE INCLUDED. FROM THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL POINT OF VIEW BOTH THESE TWO OPTIONS WOULD HAVE IMPLICATIONS SIMILAR TO THE FIRST TWO PROPOSALS (SEE PARAGRAPHS 5 AND 6 ABOVE).

8. TO ADOPT AS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL THE NEED NOT ONLY TO ENABLE THE US AND USSR TO CONTINUE POST-MBFR AND PRE-MBFR PATTERN OF TRAINING FOR THEIR STATIONED FORCES BUT ALSO TO ENSURE THAT BOTH SIDES HAD TO PRE-ANNOUNCE ALL MAJOR EXERCISES (STABILIZING MEASURE NO II) AND TO LIMIT THE NUMBER OF SUCH EXERCISES AS REQUIRED UNDER STABILISING MEASURE NO III. THIS RATIONALE WOULD BE MET IF ONLY THOSE TRAINING AREAS WHICH WERE SMALLER THAN 100 SQ KM WERE SPECIFIED AS "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS". THIS WOULD ENSURE THAT ANY DIVISIONAL SIZE EXERCISE HELD IN TRAINING AREAS, WHICH WERE LARGER IN SIZE THAN 100 SQ KM, WOULD HAVE TO BE PRE-ANNOUNCED. THE POLITICAL REQUIREMENT FOR "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS" TO INCLUDE SOME OF THE TRAINING AREAS LOCATED IN NATO TERRITORY OTHER THAN IN THE FRG WOULD ALSO BE MET.

CONCLUSION

9. ALL FOUR APPROACHES WOULD MEET THE NATO MILITARY REQUIREMENT THAT THE NORMAL PEACETIME TRAINING REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATIONED US FORCES SHOULD NOT BE INHIBITED BY ANY STABILISING MEASURES.

10. THE PROPOSALS MENTIONED AT PARAGRAPH 5 TO 7 WOULD NOT PREVENT THE USSR FROM BEING ABLE TO HOLD DIVISIONAL SIZE EXERCISES IN SUTABLE "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS" WITHOUT PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT, BUT ON THE OTHER HAND THEY SHOULD PROVIDE EACH SIDE WITH A PATTERN OF NORMAL TRAINING MOVEMENT AND THEREBY ENABLE EACH SIDE TO ASSESS THE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03597 02 OF 02 272308Z

IMPLICATIONS OF ANY MOVEMENT FALLING OUTSIDE THE NORMAL PATTERN POST MBFR.

11. THE PROPOSAL AT PARAGRAPH 8 WOULD REQUIRE BOTH SIDES TO PRE-ANNOUNCE ALL DIVISIONAL SIZE EXERCISES BUT OTHERWISE SHOULD ACHIEVE THE SAME RESULTS AS THE OTHER THREE SETS OF PROPOSALS.

12. THE PROPOSALS AT PARAGRAPHS 6, 7 AND 8 WOULD MEET THE POLITICAL REQUIREMENT THAT "DEFINED TRAINING AREAS" SHOULD NOT ON NATO'S SIDE INCLUDE ONLY TRAINING AREAS WITHIN THE FRG, WHEREAS THE US PROPOSAL (PARAGRAPH 5), AS AT PRESENT DRAFTED, WOULD NOT DO SO.
END TEXT.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO03597
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740687/abbryvvt.tel
Line Count: 240
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 3262; B) STATE 138119
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <09 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DEFINED GROUND TRAINING AREAS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005